

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MICHAEL UTT,) Case No. 2:17-cv-02820-RFB-NJK
Plaintiff,) ORDER
v.) (Docket No. 15)
MATTHEW HILLEGASS,)
Defendant.)

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 15. On December 21, 2017, the Court denied without prejudice the parties' first stipulated proposed discovery plan because it included a blank space with reference to the date of Plaintiff's initial disclosures and failed to include the certifications required by Local Rule 26-1. Docket No. 14; *see also* Docket No. 12 at 2. While the instant stipulated proposed discovery plan includes the date of Plaintiff's initial disclosures, it fails a second time to include the certifications required by Local Rule 26-1. Docket No. 15. As a one-time courtesy to the parties, and in the interest of preventing any further delay of a generally common requirement, the Court lays out the parties' specific failures regarding the certifications: the instant stipulated proposed discovery plan does not include the required statement that the parties have met and conferred about the possibility of using alternative dispute-resolution processes, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(7). The proposed discovery plan also does not include the required statement that the parties have considered consent to trial by a magistrate judge, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(8).

1 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' stipulated proposed discovery
2 plan. Docket No. 15. A renewed stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order shall be
3 filed no later than December 29, 2017. The Court advises the party to review and keep in mind the
4 Local Rules without further involvement from the Court.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 || Dated: December 26, 2017

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge